

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action mailed January 14, 2008 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, and 15 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these changes may be found in the specification, such as in paragraph [0038] and [0039], among others.

### **35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection**

Claims 1-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Itkis (USP 4,856,787). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Itkis (U.S. Patent No. 4,856,787). Claims 1, 7, and 15 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action states that “Itkis discloses memory to store machine readable game codes and a single processor (the master computer in figure 1 device 1 contains a processor), which executes said codes to offer games and bonuses”. Applicants respectfully disagree. As stated previously, Itkis also teaches that the slave devices are “intelligent (smart) game terminals comprising the microprocessor.” (Col. 2, lines 57-59). As such, the slave devices also have a processor to execute machine readable game code. Thus, Itkis teaches the use of at least 2 or more processors executing game code, namely the processor in the master game device and the microprocessor in the slave devices. Itkis does not teach the claimed limitation of a “single processor” as claim in Claims 1, 7, and 15.

However, to further prosecution of the application, Claim 1 has been amended to provide for the following features:

a terminal interface having a switch configured to communicate with each of a plurality of gaming components housed within the first game terminal; ...

a terminal interface having a switch configured to communicate with each of a plurality of gaming components housed within the second game terminal; ...

an audio interface having a first channel configured to communicate with the first game terminal and a second channel configured to communicate with the second game terminal; ...

wherein the single processor transmits a communication signal to each switch, and wherein each switch selectively routes the communication signal to at least one of the plurality of gaming components.

Amended Claims 7 and 15 provide for similar features. Itkis does not teach or suggest “a terminal interface having a switch ... wherein the single processor transmits a communication signal to each switch, and wherein each switch selectively routes the communication signal to the proper gaming component” nor does Itkis teach “an audio interface having a first channel configured to communicate with the first game terminal and a second channel configured to communicate with the second game terminal.”

Accordingly, Itkis does not teach each and every element as set forth in the claims. As to dependent claims 2-6, 8-14 and 16-20, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Itkis in view of Stepan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,621,814). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 14 depends from independent claim 7. Thus, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claim being allowable, the dependent claim must also be allowable. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-4481 (Order No.IGT1P277).

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/Adrienne Yeung/  
Adrienne Yeung  
Registration No. 44,000

P.O. Box 1687  
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687  
(408) 255-8001